

Chevalley Groups of Type G_2 as Automorphism Groups of Loops

Petr Vojtěchovský Department of Mathematics, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 50011, U.S.A.

Abstract

Let $M^*(q)$ be the unique nonassociative finite simple Moufang loop constructed over $GF(q)$. We prove that $\text{Aut}(M^*(2))$ is the Chevalley group $G_2(2)$, by extending multiplicative automorphism of $M^*(2)$ into linear automorphisms of the unique split octonion algebra over $GF(2)$. Many of our auxiliary results apply in the general case. In the course of the proof we show that every element of a split octonion algebra can be written as a sum of two elements of norm one.

1 Composition Algebras and Paige Loops

Let C be a finite-dimensional vector space over a field k , equipped with a quadratic form $N : C \rightarrow k$ and a multiplicative operation $\cdot$. Following [7], we say that $C = (C, N, +, \cdot)$ is a *composition algebra* if $(C, +, \cdot)$ is a *nonassociative* ring with identity element e , N is nondegenerate, and $N(u \cdot v) = N(u)N(v)$ is satisfied for every $u, v \in C$. The bilinear form associated with N will also be denoted by N . Recall that $N : C \times C \rightarrow k$ is defined by $N(u, v) = N(u + v) - N(u) - N(v)$. Write $u \perp v$ if $N(u, v) = 0$, and set $u^\perp = \{v \in C; u \perp v\}$.

The standard 8-dimensional real Cayley algebra $\mathbb{O}$ constructed by the *Cayley-Dickson process* (or *doubling* [7]) is the best known nonassociative composition algebra. There is a remarkably compact way of constructing $\mathbb{O}$ that avoids the iterative Cayley-Dickson process. As in [2], let $B = \{e = e_0, e_1, \dots, e_7\}$ be a basis whose vectors are multiplied according to

$$e_r^2 = -1, \quad e_{r+7} = e_r, \quad e_r e_s = -e_s e_r, \quad e_{r+1} e_{r+3} = e_{r+2} e_{r+6} = e_{r+4} e_{r+5} = e_r, \quad (1)$$

for $r, s \in \{1, \dots, 7\}$, $r \neq s$. (Alternatively, see [1, p. 122].) The norm $N(u)$ of a vector $u = \sum_{i=0}^7 a_i e_i \in \mathbb{O}$ is given by $\sum_{i=0}^7 a_i^2$.

Importantly, all the *structural constants* γ_{ijk} , defined by $e_i \cdot e_j = \sum_{k=0}^7 \gamma_{ijk} e_k$, are equal to ± 1 , and therefore the construction can be imitated over any field k . For $k = GF(q)$ of odd characteristic, let us denote the ensuing algebra by $\mathbb{O}(q)$. When q is even, the above construction does not yield a composition algebra.

The following facts about composition algebras can be found in [7]. Every non-trivial composition algebra C has dimension 2, 4 or 8, and we speak of a *complex*, *quaternion* or *octonion* algebra, respectively. We say that C is a *division algebra* if it has no zero divisors, else C is called *split*. There can be many non-isomorphic octonion algebras over a given field. Exactly one of them is guaranteed to be split. Moreover, when k is finite, all octonion algebras over k are isomorphic (and thus split). Let $\mathbb{O}(q)$ be the unique octonion algebra constructed over $GF(q)$.

All composition algebras satisfy the so-called *Moufang identities*

$$(xy)(zx) = x((yz)x), \quad x(y(xz)) = ((xy)x)z, \quad x(y(zy)) = ((xy)z)y. \quad (2)$$

These identities are the essence of Moufang loops, undoubtedly the most investigated variety of nonassociative loops. More precisely, a quasigroup $(L, \cdot)$ is a *Moufang loop* if it possesses a neutral element e and satisfies one (and hence all) of the Moufang identities (2). We refer the reader to [6] for the basic properties of loops and Moufang loops in particular. Briefly, every element x of a Moufang loop L has a both-sided inverse x^{-1} , and a subloop $\langle x, y, z \rangle$ of L generated by x, y and z is a group if and only if x, y and z associate. Specifically, every two-generated subloop of L is a group.

Paige [5] constructed one nonassociative finite simple Moufang loop for every finite field $GF(q)$. Liebeck [3] used the classification of finite simple groups in order to prove that there are no other nonassociative finite simple Moufang loops. Reflecting the current trend in loop theory, we will call these loops *Paige loops*, and we denote the unique Paige loop constructed over $GF(q)$ by $M^*(q)$.

The relation between $\mathbb{O}(q)$ and $M^*(q)$ is as follows. Let $M(q)$ be the set of all elements of $\mathbb{O}(q)$ of norm one. Then $M(q)$ is a Moufang loop with center $Z(M(q)) = \{e, -e\}$, and $M(q)/Z(M(q))$ is isomorphic to $M^*(q)$. Note that $M(q) = M^*(q)$ in characteristic 2.

Historically, all split octonion algebras and Paige loops were constructed by Zorn [9] and Paige without reference to doubling. Given a field k , consider the *vector matrix algebra* consisting of all *vector matrices*

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} a & \alpha \\ \beta & b \end{pmatrix},$$

where $a, b \in k$, $\alpha, \beta \in k^3$, addition is defined entry-wise, and multiplication by

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & \alpha \\ \beta & b \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c & \gamma \\ \delta & d \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} ac + \alpha \cdot \delta & a\gamma + d\alpha - \beta \times \delta \\ c\beta + b\delta + \alpha \times \gamma & \beta \cdot \gamma + bd \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here, $\alpha \cdot \beta$ (resp. $\alpha \times \beta$) is the standard dot product (resp. vector product) of α and β . Use $\det x = ab - \alpha \cdot \beta$ as a norm to obtain an octonion algebra. In fact, this is exactly the unique split octonion algebra over k . The identity element is

$$e = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & (0,0,0) \\ (0,0,0) & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and, when $N(x) = \det x \neq 0$, we have

$$x^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} b & -\alpha \\ -\beta & a \end{pmatrix}.$$

The purpose of this paper is to initiate the investigation of automorphism groups of Paige loops. We will extend automorphisms of $M^*(2)$ into automorphisms of $\mathbb{O}(2)$ to prove that $\text{Aut}(M^*(2))$ is the exceptional Chevalley group $G_2(2)$. We

also present several results for the general case. Since $G_2(q) \leq \text{Aut}(M(q))$, it is reasonable to expect that equality holds whenever q is prime. See Acknowledgement for more details. It is fun to watch how much information about the (boring) additive structure of a composition algebra can be obtained from the multiplication alone (cf. Lemma 2.4).

2 Multiplication versus Addition

Perhaps the single most important feature of composition algebras is the existence of the minimal equation (cf. [7, Prop 1.2.3]). Namely, every element $x \in C$ satisfies

$$x^2 - N(x, e)x + N(x)e = 0. \quad (3)$$

Furthermore, (3) is the minimal equation for x when x is not a scalar multiple of e .

Lemma 2.1 *Let C be a composition algebra, $x, y \in C$. Then*

$$N(xy, y) = N(x, e)N(y). \quad (4)$$

When $N(y) \neq 0$, we have

$$(xy^{-1})^2 - N(x, y)N(y)^{-1}xy^{-1} + N(xy^{-1})e = 0. \quad (5)$$

In particular,

$$(xy^{-1})^2 - N(x, y)xy^{-1} + e = 0 \quad (6)$$

whenever $N(x) = N(y) = 1$. In such a case, $(xy^{-1})^2 = -e$ if and only if $x \perp y$.

Proof We have $N(xy, y) = N(xy + y) - N(x)N(y) - N(y)$, and $N(xy + y) = N(x + e)N(y) = (N(x, e) + N(x) + N(e))N(y) = N(x, e)N(y) + N(x)N(y) + N(y)$. Equation (4) follows.

Substitute xy^{-1} for x into (4) to obtain $N(x, y) = N(xy^{-1}, e)N(y)$. The minimal equation

$$(xy^{-1})^2 - N(xy^{-1}, e)xy^{-1} + N(xy^{-1})e = 0$$

for xy^{-1} can then be written as (5), provided $N(y) \neq 0$. The rest is easy. $\square$

We leave the proof of the following Lemma to the reader.

Lemma 2.2 *Let*

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} a & \alpha \\ \beta & b \end{pmatrix}$$

be an element of a composition algebra C satisfying $N(x) = 1$. Then

- (i) $x^2 = e$ if and only if $(\alpha, \beta) = (0, 0)$ and $a = b \in \{1, -1\}$,
- (ii) $x^2 = -e$ if and only if $((\alpha, \beta) = (0, 0), b = a^{-1}, \text{ and } a^2 = -1)$ or $((\alpha, \beta) \neq (0, 0) \text{ and } b = -a)$,

- (iii) $x^3 = e$ if and only if $((\alpha, \beta) = (0, 0), b = a^{-1}, \text{ and } a^3 = 1)$ or $((\alpha, \beta) \neq (0, 0)$
and $b = -1 - a)$,
- (iv) $x^3 = -e$ if and only if $((\alpha, \beta) = (0, 0), b = a^{-1}, \text{ and } a^3 = -1)$ or $((\alpha, \beta) \neq$
 $(0, 0)$ and $b = 1 - a)$.

Let us denote the multiplicative order of x by $|x|$.

Lemma 2.3 *Let C be a composition algebra. Assume that $x, y \in C$ satisfy $N(x) = N(y) = 1, x \neq y$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) $|xy^{-1}| = 3$,
- (ii) $(xy^{-1})^2 + xy^{-1} + e = 0$,
- (iii) $N(x, y) = -1$,
- (iv) $N(x + y) = 1$.

Proof The equivalence of (ii) and (iii) follows from the uniqueness of the minimal equation (3). Condition (iii) is equivalent to (iv) since $N(x) = N(y) = 1$. It suffices to prove the equivalence of (i) and (ii).

As $(a^3 - e) = (a - e)(a^2 + a + e)$, there is nothing to prove when C has no zero divisors. The implication (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) is obviously true in any (composition) algebra. Let us prove (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) for a split octonion algebra C . Assume that $|xy^{-1}| = 3$, $x \neq y$, and

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} a & \alpha \\ \beta & b \end{pmatrix}, \quad y = \begin{pmatrix} c & \gamma \\ \delta & d \end{pmatrix}.$$

We prove that $N(x + y) = 1$. Direct computation yields $N(x + y) = 2 + r + s$, where $r = ad - \alpha \cdot \delta$, $s = bc - \beta \cdot \gamma$. Also,

$$xy^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} r & \varepsilon \\ \varphi & s \end{pmatrix}$$

for some $\varepsilon, \varphi \in k^3$. Since $(xy^{-1})^3 = e$, we have either $((\varepsilon, \varphi) = (0, 0), s = r^{-1}$, and $r^3 = 1)$, or $((\varepsilon, \varphi) \neq (0, 0), \text{ and } s = -1 - r)$, by Lemma 2.2. If the latter is true, we immediately get $N(x + y) = 1$. Assume the former is true. Then $r + s = r + r^{-1}$. Also, $r^3 = 1$ implies $r = 1$ or $r^2 + r + 1 = 0$. But $r = 1$ leads to $x = y$, a contradiction. Therefore $r^2 + r + 1 = 0$, i.e., $r + r^{-1} = -1$, and we get $N(x + y) = 1$ again. $\square$

There is a strong relation between the additive and multiplicative structures in composition algebras.

Lemma 2.4 *Let C, x , and y be as in Lemma 2.3. Then $N(x + y) = 1$ if and only if $x + y = -xy^{-1}x$.*

Proof The indirect implication is trivial. Assume that $N(x + y) = 1$. Then $(xy^{-1})^2 + xy^{-1} + e = 0$, and $(xy^{-1})^3 = e$. Thus $yx^{-1} = (xy^{-1})^2 = -xy^{-1} - e$. Multiplying this equality on the right by x yields $y = -xy^{-1}x - x$. $\square$

3 Doubling Triples

Any composition algebra C can be constructed from the underlying field k in three steps. Proposition 1.5.1 and Lemma 1.6.1 of [7] tell us how to do it. Imitating these results, we say that a triple $(a, b, c) \in C^3$ is a *doubling triple* if $N(a) \neq 0$, $N(b) \neq 0$, $N(c) \neq 0$, $b \in e^\perp \cap a^\perp$, $c \in e^\perp \cap a^\perp \cap b^\perp \cap (ab)^\perp$, $a \in e^\perp$ (resp. $a \notin e^\perp$) and the characteristic of k is odd (resp. even). Then $B = \{e, a, b, ab, c, ac, bc, (ab)c\}$ is a basis for C .

Construction (1) immediately shows that there is a doubling triple with $N(a) = N(b) = N(c) = 1$ when k is of odd characteristic. Such a doubling triple exists for every split octonion algebra in even characteristic, too.

Lemma 3.1 *Let k be a field of even characteristic. Then*

$$\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & (1, 0, 0) \\ (1, 0, 0) & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (0, 1, 0) \\ (0, 1, 0) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (0, 0, 1) \\ (0, 0, 1) & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

is a doubling triple consisting of elements of norm one.

Proof Straightforward computation. □

Doubling triples can be used to induce automorphisms. By an automorphism of a composition algebra C we mean a *linear* automorphism, i.e., a bijection $f : C \rightarrow C$ satisfying $f(u + v) = f(u) + f(v)$, $f(\lambda u) = \lambda f(u)$, and $f(u \cdot v) = f(u) \cdot f(v)$ for every $u, v \in C$, $\lambda \in k$. By [7, Thm 1.7.1 and Cor 1.7.2], every such automorphism is an isometry (i.e., $N(f(u)) = N(u)$), and vice versa. Springer and Veldkamp [7, Ch. 2] use algebraic groups to show that $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{O}(q))$ is the exceptional group $G_2(q)$, and more.

Proposition 3.2 *Let $(a, b, c), (a', b', c')$ be two doubling triples of a composition algebra C . Then there is an automorphism of C mapping (a, b, c) onto (a', b', c') if and only if $N(x) = N(x')$, for $x = a, b, c$.*

Proof Let k be the underlying field. The necessity is obvious since every automorphism is an isometry. Now for the sufficiency. Let $A = ke \oplus ka$, $B = A \oplus Ab$, $C = B \oplus Bc$, and similarly for $A', B', C' = C$. Define $\psi_X : X \rightarrow X' = \psi_X(X)$ (for $X = A, B, C$) by

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_A(x + ya) &= x + ya' \quad (x, y \in k), \\ \psi_B(x + yb) &= \psi_A(x) + \psi_A(y)b' \quad (x, y \in A), \\ \psi_C(x + yc) &= \psi_B(x) + \psi_B(y)c' \quad (x, y \in B). \end{aligned}$$

All maps ψ_X are clearly linear, and it is not hard to see that they are also multiplicative. (One has to use the assumption $N(x) = N(x')$.) Since a', b', c' generate $C' = C$, ψ_C is the automorphism we are looking for. □

4 Restrictions and Extensions of Automorphisms

The restriction of $h \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{O}(q))$ onto the loop $M(q)$ is a (multiplicative) automorphism. Moreover, two distinct automorphisms of $\mathbb{O}(q)$ differ on $M(q)$, because there is a basis for C consisting of unit vectors (cf. construction (1) and Lemma 3.1).

We would like to emphasize at this point how far are the metric properties of N from our intuitive understanding of (real) norms. Theorem 4.1 is not required for the rest of the paper, but is certainly of interest in its own right.

Theorem 4.1 *Every element of a split octonion algebra C is a sum of two elements of norm one.*

Proof We identify C with the vector matrix algebra over k , where the norm is given by the determinant. Let

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} a & \alpha \\ \beta & b \end{pmatrix}$$

be an element of C . First assume that $\beta \neq 0$. Note that for every $\lambda \in k$ there is $\gamma \in k^3$ such that $\gamma \cdot \beta = \lambda$. Pick $\gamma \in k^3$ so that $\gamma \cdot \beta = a + b - ab + \alpha \cdot \beta$. Then choose $\delta \in \gamma^\perp \cap \alpha^\perp \neq \emptyset$. (As usual, $\alpha \perp \delta$ if and only if $\alpha \cdot \delta = 0$.) This choice guarantees that $(a-1)(b-1) - (\alpha-\gamma) \cdot (\beta-\delta) = ab - a - b + 1 - \alpha \cdot \beta + \gamma \cdot \beta = 1$. Thus

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & \alpha \\ \beta & b \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \gamma \\ \delta & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} a-1 & \alpha-\gamma \\ \beta-\delta & b-1 \end{pmatrix}$$

is the desired decomposition of x into a sum of two elements of norm 1. Note that the above procedure works even for $\alpha = 0$.

Now assume that $\beta = 0$. If $\alpha \neq 0$, we use a symmetrical argument as before to decompose x . It remains to discuss the case when $\alpha = \beta = 0$. Then the equality

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & b \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a & (1,0,0) \\ (-1,0,0) & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (-1,0,0) \\ (1,0,0) & b \end{pmatrix}$$

does the job. □

We now know that $G_2(q)$ is a subgroup of $\text{Aut}(M(q))$. Let us consider the extension problem. Pick an automorphism g of the (not necessarily simple) Moufang loop $M(q)$. The ultimate goal is to construct $h \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{O}(q))$ such that $h \upharpoonright M(q) = g$. If this can be done, we immediately conclude that $\text{Aut}(M(q)) = G_2(q)$ for every q . We like to think of the problem as a notion “orthogonal” to Witt’s lemma. Roughly speaking, Witt’s lemma deals with extensions of partial isometries from subspaces onto finite-dimensional vector spaces, whereas we are attempting to extend a multiplicative, norm-preserving map from the first shell $M(q)$ into an automorphism (= isometry) of $\mathbb{O}(q)$. Naturally, g is not linear because $M(q)$ is not even closed under addition. However, the analogy with Witt’s lemma will become more apparent once we prove that g is, in a sense, additive (cf. Proposition 7.1).

Lemma 4.2 *Let $g \in \text{Aut}(M(q))$, and let (a, b, c) be a doubling triple for $\mathbb{O}(q)$ with $N(a) = N(b) = N(c) = 1$. Then $(g(a), g(b), g(c))$ is a doubling triple (with $N(g(a)) = N(g(b)) = N(g(c)) = 1$).*

Proof Since (a, b, c) is a doubling triple, we have $b \in e^\perp \cap a^\perp$, $c \in e^\perp \cap a^\perp \cap b^\perp$. Moreover, $a \in e^\perp$ (resp. $a \notin e^\perp$) if q is odd (resp. even). By Lemmas 2.1 and 2.3, this is equivalent to $b^2 = c^2 = (ab^{-1})^2 = (ac^{-1})^2 = (bc^{-1})^2 = ((ab)c^{-1})^2 = -e$, and $a^2 = -e$ (resp. $|a| = 3$). Because $g \in \text{Aut}(M(q))$, we have $g(b)^2 = g(c)^2 = (g(a)g(b)^{-1})^2 = (g(a)g(c)^{-1})^2 = (g(b)g(c)^{-1})^2 = ((g(a)g(b))g(c)^{-1})^2 = -e$ and $g(a)^2 = -e$ (resp. $|g(a)| = 3$). Another application of Lemmas 2.1 and 2.3 shows that $(g(a), g(b), g(c))$ is a doubling triple. $\square$

In particular, the mapping $h = \psi_{\mathbb{O}(q)}$ constructed from g and (a, b, c) by Proposition 3.2 is an automorphism of $\mathbb{O}(q)$ satisfying $\psi(x) = g(x)$, for $x = a, b, c$.

Remark 4.3 This extension h can be obtained in another way when the characteristic is odd. Namely, construct $\mathbb{O}(q)$ as in section 1, and define $h : \mathbb{O}(q) \longrightarrow \mathbb{O}(q)$ by

$$h\left(\sum_{i=0}^7 a_i e_i\right) = \sum_{i=0}^7 a_i g(e_i).$$

Obviously, h is linear. For fixed i, j , only one of the 8 structural constants γ_{ijk} is nonzero, and it is equal to ± 1 . Using linearity of h , it is therefore easy to check that h is multiplicative.

By the construction, h coincides with g on a basis B . However, we do not know whether h is an extension of g . The fact that $h \upharpoonright B = g \upharpoonright B$ does not guarantee that $h \upharpoonright M(q) = g$, since B does not need to generate $M(q)$ by multiplication. Interestingly enough, it seems to never be the case! The key to answering these questions is to look at the additive properties of g .

5 Automorphisms of Finite Octonion Algebras

We have entered a more technical part of the paper. In this section, we construct a family of automorphisms of $\mathbb{O}(q)$.

Let $k = GF(q)$, and let $\text{Lie}(q)$ be the three-dimensional Lie algebra k^3 with vector product $\times$ playing the role of a Lie bracket. A linear transformation $f : \text{Lie}(q) \longrightarrow \text{Lie}(q)$ belongs to $\text{Aut}(\text{Lie}(q))$ if and only if $f(\alpha \times \beta) = f(\alpha) \times f(\beta)$ is satisfied for every $\alpha, \beta \in k^3$. We say that a linear transformation f is *orthogonal* if $f(\alpha) \cdot f(\beta) = \alpha \cdot \beta$ for every $\alpha, \beta \in k^3$.

Lemma 5.1 *For a non-singular orthogonal linear transformation $f : k^3 \longrightarrow k^3$, let $\hat{f} : \mathbb{O}(q) \longrightarrow \mathbb{O}(q)$ be the mapping*

$$\hat{f} \begin{pmatrix} a & \alpha \\ \beta & b \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a & f(\alpha) \\ f(\beta) & b \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $\hat{f} \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{O}(q))$ if and only if $f \in \text{Aut}(\text{Lie}(q))$.

Proof The map $\widehat{f}$ is clearly linear and preserves the norm. Since f is one-to-one, so is $\widehat{f}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \widehat{f} \begin{pmatrix} a & \alpha \\ \beta & b \end{pmatrix} \widehat{f} \begin{pmatrix} c & \gamma \\ \delta & d \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} ac + f(\alpha) \cdot f(\delta) & af(\gamma) + df(\alpha) - f(\beta) \times f(\delta) \\ cf(\beta) + bf(\delta) + f(\alpha) \times f(\gamma) & f(\beta) \cdot f(\gamma) + bd \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\widehat{f} \left(\begin{pmatrix} a & \alpha \\ \beta & b \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c & \gamma \\ \delta & d \end{pmatrix} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} ac + \alpha \cdot \delta & f(a\gamma + d\alpha - \beta \times \delta) \\ f(c\beta + b\delta + \alpha \times \gamma) & \beta \cdot \gamma + bd \end{pmatrix}.$$

Sufficiency is now obvious, and necessity follows by specializing the elements $a, b, c, d, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$. $\square$

For a map f , let $-f$ be the map *opposite* to f , i.e., $(-f)(u) = -(f(u))$. Also, for a permutation $\pi \in S_3$, consider π as a linear transformation on k^3 defined by

$$\pi(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) = (\alpha_{\pi(1)}, \alpha_{\pi(2)}, \alpha_{\pi(3)}).$$

Apparently, $-S_3 = \{-\pi; \pi \in S_3\}$ is a set of non-singular orthogonal linear transformations.

Lemma 5.2 $\widehat{-\pi} \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{O}(q))$ for every $\pi \in S_3$.

Proof Let $\pi \in S_3$ be the transposition interchanging 1 and 2, and let $\alpha, \beta \in k^3$. Then

$$\pi(\alpha \times \beta) = (\alpha_3\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_3, \alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_2, \alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_1),$$

and

$$\pi(\alpha) \times \pi(\beta) = (\alpha_1\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_1, \alpha_3\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_3, \alpha_2\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_2).$$

Hence $-\pi(\alpha \times \beta) = \pi(\alpha) \times \pi(\beta) = (-\pi)(\alpha) \times (-\pi)(\beta)$. Thanks to the symmetry of S_3 , we have shown that $-\pi \in \text{Aut}(\text{Lie}(q))$ for every $\pi \in S_3$. The rest follows from Lemma 5.1. $\square$

Observe there is another automorphism when q is even:

Lemma 5.3 Define $\partial : \mathbb{O}(q) \longrightarrow \mathbb{O}(q)$ by

$$\partial \begin{pmatrix} a & \alpha \\ \beta & b \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} b & \beta \\ \alpha & a \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $\partial \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{O}(q))$ if and only if $q = 2^n$.

Finally, we look at conjugations. Let L be a Moufang loop. For $x \in L$, define the conjugation $T_x : L \longrightarrow L$ by $T_x(y) = x^{-1}yx$, where $x^{-1}yx$ is unambiguous thanks to the properties of L . Not every conjugation of L is an automorphism. By [6, Thm IV.1.6], $T_x \in \text{Aut}(L)$ if $x^3 = e$. (And it is not difficult to show that $x^3 = e$ is also a necessary condition, provided L is simple.)

6 Transitivity of the Natural Action

We take advantage of the automorphisms defined in section 5, and investigate the natural action of $\text{Aut}(M^*(2))$ on $M^*(2) = M(2)$. The lattice of subloops of $M^*(2)$ was fully described in [8]. Here, we only focus on the action of $\text{Aut}(M^*(2))$ on involutions and on subgroups of $M^*(2)$ isomorphic to V_4 .

Once again, identify $\mathbb{O}(2)$ with the vector matrix algebra.

By Lemma 2.2, $M^*(2)$ contains only elements of order 1, 2 and 3. Furthermore, every involution $x \in M^*(2)$ is of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & \alpha \\ \beta & a \end{pmatrix},$$

for some $a \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\alpha, \beta \in k^3$. In order to linearize our notation, we write $x = [\alpha, \beta]$ when the value of a is clear from α, β , or when it is not important; and $x = [\alpha, \beta]_a$ otherwise.

Similarly, every element $x \in M^*(2)$ of order 3 is of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & \alpha \\ \beta & 1+a \end{pmatrix}.$$

To save space, we write $x = \{\alpha, \beta\}_a$.

We will sometimes leave out commas and parentheses. Thus, both 110 and (110) stand for $(1, 1, 0)$. The commutator of x and y will be denoted by $[x, y]$.

Proposition 6.1 *Let $x = [\alpha, \beta]_a$, $y = [\gamma, \delta]_b$ be two involutions of $M^*(2)$, $x \neq y$. Then:*

- (i) $[x, y] = e$ if and only if $|xy| = 2$ if and only if $\langle x, y \rangle \cong V_4$ if and only if $\alpha \cdot \delta = \beta \cdot \gamma$.
- (ii) $[x, y] \neq e$ if and only if $|xy| = 3$ if and only if $\langle x, y \rangle \cong S_3$ if and only if $\alpha \cdot \delta \neq \beta \cdot \gamma$.
- (iii) x is contained in a subgroup isomorphic to S_3 ,
- (iv) every subgroup of $M^*(2)$ isomorphic to S_3 contains an involution of the form $[\ , \]_0$.

Proof The involution x commutes with y if and only if $|xy| = 2$. Since

$$xy = \begin{pmatrix} ab + \alpha \cdot \delta & - \\ - & ab + \beta \cdot \gamma \end{pmatrix},$$

parts (i) and (ii) follow.

Given $x = [\alpha, \beta]_a$, pick $\delta \in \alpha^\perp$, $\gamma \notin \beta^\perp$, and choose $b \in \{0, 1\}$ so that $y = [\gamma, \delta]_b \in M^*(2)$. Then $\langle x, y \rangle \cong S_3$, and (iii) is proved.

Let $G \leq M^*(2)$, $G \cong S_3$. Let $x = [\alpha, \beta]_1$, $y = [\gamma, \delta]_1 \in G$, $x \neq y$. Then

$$xy = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \alpha \cdot \delta & \alpha + \gamma + \beta \times \delta \\ \beta + \delta + \alpha \times \gamma & 1 + \beta \cdot \gamma \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $|xy| = 3$, we have $\alpha \cdot \delta \neq \beta \cdot \gamma$. In other words, $\alpha \cdot \delta + \beta \cdot \gamma = 1$. Then the third involution $xyx \in G$ equals

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 + \alpha \cdot \delta + (\alpha + \gamma) \cdot \beta & - \\ - & - \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \cdot \beta & - \\ - & - \end{pmatrix}.$$

But $\alpha \cdot \beta = 0$, as $\det x = 1$. □

Lemma 6.2 *Let $x \in G \leq M$ be an element of order 3, $G \cong S_3$, and M a Moufang loop. Then $T_x \in \text{Aut}(M)$ permutes the involutions of G .*

Proof Let $G = \langle x, y \rangle \cong S_3$ with $|y| = 2$. The remaining two involutions of G are xy and yx . Then $T_x(y) = x^{-1}yx = xy$, $T_x(xy) = yx$, and $T_x(yx) = y$. This can be seen from any presentation of G , or easily via the natural representation of S_3 with $x = (1, 2, 3)$, $y = (1, 2) \in S_3$. □

We are going to show that $\text{Aut}(M^*(2))$ acts transitively on the subgroups of $M^*(2)$ isomorphic to C_2 — the *copies* of C_2 in $M^*(2)$. Let

$$x_0 = [111, 111]$$

be the canonical involution. For a vector α , let $w(\alpha)$ be the *weight* of α , i.e., the number of nonzero coordinates of α .

Proposition 6.3 *The group $\text{Aut}(M^*(2))$ acts transitively on the copies of C_2 in $M^*(2)$.*

Proof Let $x = [\alpha, \beta]_a$ be an involution. We transform x into x_0 . By Proposition 6.1(iii), x is contained in some $G \cong S_3$. By Lemma 6.2 and Proposition 6.1(iv), we may assume that $a = 0$.

Let $r = w(\alpha)$, $s = w(\beta)$. Using the automorphism ∂ from Lemma 5.3 we can assume that $r \geq s$. We now transform x into x' so that $x' = x_0$ or $x' = x_1$ or $\langle x', x_0 \rangle \cong S_3$ or $\langle x', x_1 \rangle \cong S_3$, where $x_1 = [100, 100]$.

If $r \not\equiv s \pmod{2}$, then $\langle x, x_0 \rangle \cong S_3$, by Proposition 6.1(ii). Suppose that $r \equiv s$. Every permutation of coordinates can be made into an automorphism of $M^*(2)$, by Lemma 5.2. The involution x_0 is invariant under all permutations. Since $a = 0$, we must have $s > 0$, and thus $(r, s) = (2, 2), (1, 1), (3, 1)$ or $(3, 3)$. If $(r, s) = (2, 2)$, transform x into $x' = [110, 011]$, and note that $\langle x', x_1 \rangle \cong S_3$. If $(r, s) = (1, 1)$, transform x into $x' = x_1$. If $(r, s) = (3, 1)$, transform x into $x' = [111, 001]$. Once again, $\langle x', x_1 \rangle \cong S_3$. Finally, if $(r, s) = (3, 3)$, we have $x = x' = x_0$.

Now, when $\langle x', x_i \rangle \cong S_3$ for some $i \in \{0, 1\}$, we can permute the involutions of $\langle x', x_i \rangle$ so that x' is mapped onto x_i , by Lemma 6.2.

It remains to show how to transform x_1 into x_0 . For that matter, consider the element $y = \{001, 101\}_1$, and check that $x_0 = T_y(x_1)$. □

Let us now continue by showing that there are at most two orbits of transitivity for copies of V_4 . (In fact, there are exactly two orbits but we will not need this fact.)

Put

$$u_0 = [000, 110], \quad u_1 = [001, 001], \quad u_2 = [100, 010].$$

Lemma 6.4 *Let $V_4 \cong \langle u, v \rangle \leq M^*(2)$. There is $f \in \text{Aut}(M^*(2))$ such that $f(u) = x_0$ and $f(v)$ is one of the two elements u_1, u_2 .*

Proof By Proposition 6.3, we may assume that $u = x_0$. Write $v = [\alpha, \beta]$, $r = w(\alpha)$, $s = w(\beta)$. We have $r \equiv s$, else $\langle u, v \rangle \cong S_3$. Thanks to the automorphism ∂ , we may assume that $r \leq s$. If $(r, s) = (0, 2)$, transform v into u_0 ; if $(r, s) = (1, 1)$, into u_1 or u_2 ; if $(r, s) = (1, 3)$, into $u_3 = [001, 111]$; if $(r, s) = (2, 2)$, into $u_4 = [110, 110]$ or $u_5 = [011, 101]$.

Let $v_1 = \{010, 110\}_0$, $v_2 = \{001, 101\}_0$, and define $f_1 = T_{v_2^{-1}} \circ T_{v_1}$, $f_2 = T_{v_1^{-1}} \circ T_{v_2}$ (compose mappings from the right to the left). Then f_1, f_2 are automorphisms of $M^*(2)$, and one can check directly that $f_1(x_0) = f_2(x_0) = x_0$. Moreover, $f_1(u_4) = u_1$, $f_1(u_3) = u_2$, $f_1(u_5) = u_3$, and $f_2(u_5) = \partial(u_0)$. Thus u_4 can be transformed into u_1 , and each of u_0, u_3, u_5 into u_2 . $\square$

7 Main Result

We are now ready to demonstrate that the map $h : \mathbb{O}(2) \longrightarrow \mathbb{O}(2)$ constructed in section 4 is an extension of g .

Proposition 7.1 *Let C be a composition algebra, and let $M \subseteq C$ be the set of all elements of norm 1. Assume that $x, y \in M$ are such that $x + y \in M$. Then $g(x + y) = g(x) + g(y)$ for every $g \in \text{Aut}(M)$.*

Proof If $x = y$, we have $1 = N(x + y) = N(2x) = 4N(x) = 4$. Therefore the characteristic is 3, and $g(x) + g(x) = -g(x) = g(-x) = g(x + x)$.

Assume that $x \neq y$. By Lemma 2.3, $|xy^{-1}| = 3$, and so $|g(x)g(y)^{-1}| = |g(xy^{-1})| = 3$ as well. Then $N(g(x) + g(y)) = 1$, again by Lemma 2.3. Consequently, we use Lemma 2.4 twice to obtain $g(x) + g(y) = -g(x)g(y)^{-1}g(x) = g(-xy^{-1}x) = g(x + y)$. $\square$

We proceed to prove by induction on the number of summands that

$$g\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n g(x_i)$$

for every $g \in \text{Aut}(M^*(2))$ and $x_1, \dots, x_n \in M^*(2)$ such that $x_1 + \dots + x_n \in M^*(2)$.

Lemma 7.2 *Suppose that $x, y \in M^*(2)$, $x \neq y$, are such that none of $x + e, y + e, x + y$ belongs to $M^*(2)$. Then $\langle x, y \rangle \cong V_4$, and there are $a, b \in M^*(2)$ such that $a + b = e$, and $x + a, y + b \in M^*(2)$.*

Proof We have $N(x + e) = 0$, i.e., $N(x, e) = 0 - 1 - 1 = 0$. Then, by Lemma 2.1, $x^2 = (xe^{-1})^2 = -e = e$. Similarly, $y^2 = (xy^{-1})^2 = e$.

Since $\langle x, y \rangle \cong V_4$, we may assume that $(x, y) = (x_0, u_1)$ or $(x, y) = (x_0, u_2)$, where x_0, u_1, u_2 are as in Lemma 6.4. When $(x, y) = (x_0, u_1)$, let $a = \{011, 010\}_1$, else put $a = \{110, 100\}_1$. In both cases, let $b = e - a$, and verify that $x + a, y + b \in M^*(2)$. $\square$

Proposition 7.3 *Let $x_1, \dots, x_n \in M^*(2)$ be such that $x = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ belongs to $M^*(2)$. Then*

$$g\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n g(x_i).$$

Proof The case $n = 1$ is trivial, and $n = 2$ is just Proposition 7.1. Assume that $n \geq 3$ and that the Proposition holds for all $m < n$. We can assume that at least two summands x_i are different, say $x_{n-2} \neq x_{n-1}$. Since $g(xx_n^{-1}) = g(x)g(x_n)^{-1}$, we can furthermore assume that $x_n = e$. When at least one of $x_{n-2} + e$, $x_{n-1} + e$, $x_{n-2} + x_{n-1}$ belongs to $M^*(2)$, we are done by the induction hypothesis. Otherwise, Lemma 7.2 applies, and there are $a, b \in M^*(2)$ such that $a + x_{n-2}, b + x_{n-1} \in M^*(2)$, and $a + b = e$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} g(x) &= g(x_1 + \dots + x_{n-3} + (x_{n-2} + a) + (x_{n-1} + b)) \\ &= g(x_1) + \dots + g(x_{n-3}) + g(x_{n-2} + a) + g(x_{n-1} + b) \\ &= g(x_1) + \dots + g(x_{n-1}) + g(a) + g(b) \\ &= g(x_1) + \dots + g(x_{n-1}) + g(a + b), \end{aligned}$$

and we are through. □

Theorem 7.4 *Every automorphism of $M^*(2)$ can be uniquely extended into an automorphism of $\mathbb{O}(2)$. In particular, $\text{Aut}(M^*(2))$ is isomorphic to $G_2(2)$.*

Proof Pick $g \in \text{Aut}(M^*(2))$. Using the basic triple for $\mathbb{O}(2)$ from Lemma 3.1 construct an automorphism $h = \psi_{\mathbb{O}(2)}$ of $\mathbb{O}(2)$, as in Proposition 3.2. Then g, h coincide on a basis induced by the doubling triple. Every element of $M^*(2)$ is a sum of some of the basis elements. Hence, by Proposition 7.3, g and h coincide on $M^*(2)$.

This extension is unique. Thus $\text{Aut}(M^*(2)) = \text{Aut}(\mathbb{O}(2))$, and $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{O}(2))$ is isomorphic to $G_2(2)$ by a theorem of Springer and Veldkamp. □

8 Acknowledgement

Most of this paper is extracted from the author's Ph. D. thesis [8]. I would like to acknowledge the support of the Department of Mathematics at Iowa State University. I also thank the Grant Agency of Charles University for partially supporting my visit to Oxford (grant number 269/2001/B-MAT/MFF).

Shortly before this paper was accepted for publication, Gábor P. Nagy and the author proved [4], using completely different methods, that $\text{Aut}(M^*(k))$ is the semidirect product $G_2(k) \rtimes \text{Aut}(k)$, for every perfect field k .

References

- [1] J. H. Conway, N. J. A. Sloane, *Sphere packings, lattices and groups*, third edition, Springer Verlag (1999).

- [2] H. S. M. Coxeter, *Integral Cayley Numbers*, Duke Mathematical Journal, Vol. **13**, No. 4 (1946). Reprinted in H. S. M. Coxeter, *Twelve Geometric Essays*, Southern Illinois University Press (1968).
- [3] M. W. Liebeck, *The classification of finite simple Moufang loops*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **102** (1987), 33–47.
- [4] G. P. Nagy, P. Vojtěchovský, *Automorphism Groups of Simple Moufang Loops over Perfect Fields*, submitted.
- [5] L. Paige, *A class of simple Moufang loops*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **7** (1956), 471–482.
- [6] H. O. Pflugfelder, *Quasigroups and Loops: Introduction*, (Sigma series in pure mathematics; **7**), Heldermann Verlag Berlin (1990).
- [7] T. A. Springer, F. D. Veldkamp, *Octonions, Jordan Algebras, and Exceptional Groups*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer Verlag (2000).
- [8] P. Vojtěchovský, *Finite Simple Moufang Loops*, Ph. D. thesis, Iowa State University (2001). Available at www.vojtechovsky.com.
- [9] M. Zorn, *Theorie der alternativen Ringe*, Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg **8** (1931), 123–147.